REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 6-10 are pending.

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

§ 102 Rejections

Claims 1-4 and 6-10 remain rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as purportedly being anticipated by WO 01/64805 A2.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, and 10

Claim 1 requires, in part, "a poly(meth)acrylate ester having a group capable of being activated by ultraviolet radiation." As clearly set forth in the specification, "This ultraviolet active group can generate a free radical in the release agent precursor by irradiation with ultraviolet radiation. The generated free radical promotes crosslinking of the release agent precursor and adhesion to the substrate, resulting in an improvement in adhesion between the substrate and the release agent." Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would readily appreciate that claim 1 requires a group that can generate a free radical in the release precursor by irradiation with ultraviolet light.

According to the Patent Office, "any of the pendant ester groups in poly(2-ethylhexyl) acrylate [of WO 01/64805 A2] are capable of some form of activation (i.e., elevation electron from a lower-energy molecular orbital to a higher energy molecular orbital) upon UV irradiation." (Final Office Action, dated 2/19/09, page 3.) Even assuming this were accurate, the Patent Office has failed to show how these pendant ester groups can form a free radical, as required by claim 1.

For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 1 is improper and should be withdrawn. Claims 3, 4, 7, 9, and 10 depend from claim 1 and add patentable features thereto; thus, claims 3, 4, 7, 9, and 10 are likewise patentable.

Claim 2

Claim 2 depends from claim 1, and further requires that "the poly(meth)acrylate ester has a group capable of being activated by ultraviolet radiation derived from benzophenone."

The Patent Office has failed to show how WO 01/64805 A2 describes, teaches or suggests a group capable of being activated by ultraviolet radiation derived from benzophenone. For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 2 is unwarranted and should be withdrawn.

Claims 6

Claim 6 provides a process for producing an acrylic release agent article, which comprises, in part, the step of: coating a substrate with an acrylic release agent precursor which contains a poly(meth)acrylate ester having a group capable of being activated by ultra violet radiation.

As discussed above, in view of the specification, on of ordinary skill in the art would readily understand that this group must be one that "can generate a free radical in the release precursor by irradiation with ultraviolet light." For at least the reasons stated above, the Patent Office has failed to show how WO 01/64805 A2 describes teaches or suggests such a group.

For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 1 is improper and should be withdrawn. Claims 7, 9, and 10 depend from claim 6 and add patentable features thereto; thus, claims 7, 9, and 10 are likewise patentable.

Claim 8

Claim 8 depends from claim 1, through intervening claim 7. Claim 8 further requires that the group capable of being activated by ultraviolet radiation be "derived from benzophenone."

As discussed above, the Patent Office has failed to show how WO 01/64805 A2 describes teaches or suggests such a group. For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 8 is improper and should be withdrawn.

In summary, he rejections of claims 1-4 and 6-10 under 35 USC § 102(b) as purportedly being anticipated by WO 01/64805 are unwarranted and should be withdrawn.

Double-Patenting

Claim 10 remains rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,660,354.

Claim 10 is directed to **a release agent article** and depends from claim 1, with intervening claim 7; thus claim 10 requires all of the limitations of claims 1 and 7. Claim 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,660,354 is directed to **a process** for producing a release material article and fails to include several limitations required by claim 10, including those present in claim 1 from which it depends.

According to the Patent Office, the disclosure of U.S. Patent No. 6,660,354 is the same as WO 01/64805 A2, upon which the pending rejections under 35 USC § 102(b) rely. For at least the reasons stated above, the Patent Office has failed to show how this reference renders obvious claim 1. For at least these reasons, the obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claim 10 is improper and should be withdraw,

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

April 9, 2009
Date

By: /Thomas M. Spielbauer/
Thomas M. Spielbauer, Reg. No.: 58,492
Telephone No.: 651-736-9814

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833